

APPENDIX A: CODE SHEET FOR METHODOLOGICAL RIGOR AND EFFECT SIZE COMPUTATION

WASHINGTON STATE PROJECT CODE SHEET FOR METHODOLOGICAL RIGOR AND EFFECT SIZE COMPUTATION

I. Identifying Information

Coder's Initials: _____

Reviewed by: _____

Document Reference

Date of Publication : _____

Author : _____

Full Reference: _____

Type of Publication: (check one)

Book _____

Book Chapter _____

Government Report: Federal _____ State/Local _____

Peer reviewed journal _____

Unpublished (technical report, convention paper) _____

Type of Program: (Check one, if two circle the primary program area)

Substance Abuse _____ Sex Offender _____ Life Skills _____ Anger Management _____

Victim Awareness _____ Adult Education _____ Correctional Work _____

Vocational Training _____ Private Correctional Industries _____ Work Ethic Camp _____

Community Employment _____ Moral Reconation Therapy _____

II. Methodological Rigor

1. Sample Size

* Sum the number of the treatment and comparison units (record range)

Individual _____ Families _____

Classrooms _____ Schools _____

Communities _____ Other collectivity (specify) _____

Blocks, cities, or other geographical units _____

2. Presence of comparison group(s) _____

3. Use of control variables to account for initial group difference _____

4. Variable measures _____

5. Control for effects of attrition from study _____

6. Post Treatment measurement period

Length of time from end of treatment to last follow-up (in months) _____

7. Use of statistically significant tests (0 or 1) _____

8. Overall evaluation of methodology (1-5) _____

Reason for Score:

III. Identification of Outcome Measures:

Check here if no comparison is available: _____ (end coding)

Outcome Measure of Recidivism:

- * Record the recidivism outcome measure(s) below. If more than one, attach additional sheets.
- * List first the number (1-4) corresponding to the method of reporting and specifically state the nature of each outcome measure (arrest [type if available], technical supervision violation, new crime supervision violation, technical revocation, new crime revocation, other return to incarceration, conviction, etc.)

<u>Number</u>	<u>Description of Individual Recidivism Measure(s)</u>
A:	_____
B :	_____
C:	_____
D:	_____
E:	_____

IV. Program Effects and Effect Size Computation

- * Circle the letter (outcome measure) to which the following summary applies.

Outcome Measure: A B C D E

1. Base Rate:

Pre-treatment for treatment group :

Mean _____ Standard Deviation _____

Time period covered, in months (e.g. 12 months, 24 months) _____

Comparison group :

Mean _____ Standard Deviation _____

Time period covered, in months (e.g. 13 months, 24 months) _____

2. Post-treatment measurement time period (in months): _____
3. Mean and standard deviation or proportion (for rates) for the outcome measure for the treatment and comparison groups:

Treatment group mean or proportion : _____

Comparison group mean or proportion : _____

Treatment group

standard deviation _____ or variance _____

Comparison group

standard deviation _____ or variance _____

Pooled standard deviation _____ or variance _____

4. Mean and standard deviation or proportion (for rates) for the pre- and post-treatment for the treatment group:

Post-treatment mean or proportion : _____

Pre-treatment mean or proportion : _____

Post-treatment group

standard deviation _____ or variance _____

Pre-treatment group

standard deviation _____ or variance _____

Pooled standard deviation _____ or variance _____

5. Effect Size

For pre- to post-comparison for the treatment group : _____

For pre- to post-comparison for the comparison group : _____

For post-treatment comparison of treatment and comparison

groups: _____

6. Direction of Effect:

For treatment/comparison group design : (Check one)

Treatment group has less problem behavior at post-test than comparison group : _____

Comparison group has less problem behavior at post-test than treatment group : _____

For pre-post design : (Check one)

Post-level of problem behavior is lower than pre-level : _____

Pre-level of problem behavior is lower than post-level : _____

No difference exists between pre and post-measures : _____

7. Pearson correlation between measure of experimental status (treatment/control) and outcome measure: _____

8. Statistical test used for assessing the probability that difference (between treatment and comparison groups or pre- to post) is due to chance.

A. Chi-square statistic (with one degree of freedom, i.e. from a 2x2 table):

chi-square value: _____

Exact 2-tailed p-value: _____ (if reported)

Nominal significance level (2-tailed): (circle below)

p<.05: yes no; p<.01: yes no

B. t statistic for difference between means:

t-value: _____

Degrees of freedom: _____

OR sample size for each condition:

Treatment group/post-comparison "n": _____

Comparison group/pre-condition "n": _____

C. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA):

F-statistic: _____

degrees of freedom for the numerator: _____

degrees of freedom for the denominator: _____

eta: _____ eta squared: _____

sum of squares in the numerator: _____

sum of squares in the denominator: _____

number of cases in each condition:

Treatment group/post-comparison "n": _____

Comparison group/pre-condition "n": _____

Exact 2-tailed p-value: _____ (if reported)

Nominal significance level: (circle below)

p<.05: yes no; p<.01: yes no

D. Other statistical test:

Name of test: _____

Exact p-level: _____

Nominal significance level: (circle below)

p<.05: yes no

p<.01: yes no

9. Specifically describe the components of the program being evaluated in the study:

**REPEAT SECTION III ON A SEPARATE CODING SHEET FOR EVERY
RECIDIVISM OUTCOME MEASURE LISTED.**

APPENDIX B:
TABLES CONTAINING
EVALUATION RESEARCH STUDIES

CHAPTER 2

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Studies of Adult Basic Education and Recidivism Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings

Evaluation Study Review	Methods Score & No. of Cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Harer (1995a)	4 n = 1,205,	.11	ABE participants whom entered prison with an 8th grade education level or less had a lower rate of rearrest or parole revocation (46.7%) than non-participants (52.2%) after 36 months, NT. ¹
		-.07	ABE participants with some high school education were rearrested or had their parole revoked at a higher rate (57.8%) than non-participants (54.5 %), NT. ¹
		.16	ABE participants who had already obtained a high school diploma prior to admission were rearrested or had their parole revoked at a lower rate (31.2%) than non-participants (38.9%), NT. ¹
		-.05	ABE participants with some college education at admission were rearrested or had their parole revoked at a higher rate (31.6%) than non-participants (29.3%), NT. ¹

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

1 = Significance tests were completed only for any education participation and not separately for ABE.

Studies of Adult Basic Education and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.

Evaluation Study Review	Methods Score & No. of Cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Harer (1995b)	4 n = 619	.16	Inmates with an educational level of 8th grade or lower who participated in correctional education programming (GED, ABE, & ACE) had a lower rate of reincarceration (45%) than equivalent non-participants (52.9%) during the 36 month follow-up period, NT.
		.32	Inmates with some high school education upon entry who participated in correctional education programs (ABE, GED, and ACE) had a lower rate of reincarceration (47.1%) than equivalent non-participants (62.7%), NT.
		.32	Inmates with a high school diploma who participated in academic education (ACE) had a lower reincarceration rate (24.5%) than equivalent non-participants (39.2%), NT.
Ohio Department of Rehabilitation & Corrections (1995)	3 n = 18,068	-.04	In a two-year follow-up, ABE participants had a higher rate of reincarceration (32.3%) than non-participants (30.6%), NT.
		.10	GED completers had a lower reincarceration rate (27.9%) than non-participants (32.3%), NT.
		.18	GED participants had a lower reincarceration rate (24.1%) than non-participants (32.3%), NT.
Texas Youth Commission (1993)	3 n = 1,717	.25	In a 12 month follow-up, GED completers were rearrested at a lower rate (41.3%) than the control group (53.5%), NS.
		.26	Reincarceration rates for GED completers was lower (10.1%), than non-completers (19.1%), NS.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

Studies of Adult Basic Education and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.

Evaluation Study Review	Methods Score & No. of Cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Walsh (1985)	3 n = 100	.63	In a 42 month follow-up, GED completers had a lower rearrest rate (16%) than the comparison group (44%), S.
		-.25	GED non-completers had a higher rearrest rate (32%) than non-participants (44%), NS.
Siegal & Basta (1997)	2 n = 277	.23	PALS participants were rearrested at a lower rate (35%) than non-participants (46%), NS.
		.05	PALS participants were reconvicted at a lower rate (20%) than non-participants (22%), NS.
		.47	GED participants had a lower rate of rearrest (24%) than non-participants (46%), S.
		.00	GED participants were not distinguishable for non-participants with respect to reconviction rates, NS.
Piehl (1995)	2 n = 1,473	.14	Those who completed on educational program had fewer reincarceration (33.5%) than those who were eligible but did not complete a program (40.2%), NS.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

Studies of Adult Basic Education and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.

Evaluation Study Review	Methods Score & No. of Cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Adams et al. (1994)	2 n = 14,411	.02	After an average of 25 months, Windham participants returned to prison at a lower rate (23.0%), than non-participants (23.7%), NT.
		.01	Windham non-mandatory participants were returned to prison at a lower rate (22.2%) than non-mandatory non-participants (22.3%), NT.
		.05	Windham mandatory participants had a lower return rate (23.1%) than mandatory non-participants (25.3%), NT.
		-.03	Windham participants who enrolled in 100 or fewer hours of academic training had a higher rate of return to prison (25%) than non-participants (23.6%), NT.
		.07	Inmates who were schooled for 101-200 hours had a lower reincarceration rate (20.7%), than non-participants (23.6%), NT.
		.04	Academic participants who received 201-300 hours of class time had a lower return rate (21.8%) than non-participants (23.6%), NT.
		.18	Inmates who received 301+ hours of educational training had a lower reincarceration rate (16.6%) than non-participants (23.6%), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

Studies of Adult Basic Education and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.

Evaluation Study Review	Methods Score & No. of Cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Fabelo (1992)	2 n = 281	.60	Fewer GED participants and completers were returned to prison (0%) than controls (9%), NT.
		-.29	In an 18 month follow-up, drop-outs were reincarcerated at a higher rate (19%) than the control group (9%), NT.
New York State Dept. of Corrections (1992)	2 n = 15,520	.11	Over a 12 - 42 month period, inmates who satisfactorily participated in a GED program were returned to prison at a lower rate (34.0%) than unsatisfactory program participants (39.1%), S.
Porporino & Robinson (1992)	2 n = 1,736	.24	ABE program graduates had a lower reincarceration rate (30.1%) than those that withdrew from the program (41.6%) during the 14 months following release, S.
		.12	ABE participants had a lower reincarceration rate (30.1%) than non-completers (35.7%), S.
Schumacker et al. (1990)	2 n = 760	.16	In 12 month follow-up, vocational participants experienced a lower reconviction or reincarceration rate (21%) than the control group (28%), NT.
		.21	Vocational/academic participants had a lowest reconviction or reincarceration rate (19%) when compared to the control group (28%), NT.
		.14	Academic participants had a lower reconviction/reincarceration rate (22%) than the comparison group (28%), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Adult Basic Education and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Review	Methods Score & No. of Cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Ramsey (1988)	2 n = 200	.46	GED completers were reincarcerated at a lower rate (16%) than non-participants (36%) during the 5-6 year follow-up period, NT.
		.13	GED completers had a lower re-arrest rate (32%) than the comparison group (38%), NT.
		.06	GED participants were reincarcerated at a lower rate (33%) than the comparison group (36%), NT.
		.13	GED participants were re-arrested at a lower rate (32%) than non-participants (38%), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

CHAPTER 3 CORRECTIONAL INDUSTRIES

Studies of Correctional Industries and Recidivism Showing Scientific Methods Scores and Findings

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Maguire et al. (1988)	4 n = 896	.11	Industry participants have fewer felony rearrests (29%) than controls (34%), NS.
Saylor & Gaes (1996)	3 n = 7,000+	NR	After a follow-up period of from 8 to 12 years, industry participants have a 24% ¹ lower risk of new offense recommitment than matched controls, S.
		NR	After a follow-up period of from 8 to 12 years, vocational/ training/ apprenticeship participants have a 33% ¹ lower risk of new offense recommitment than matched controls, S.
		NR	After a follow-up period of from 8 to 12 years, industry/training/ apprenticeship participants have a 23% ¹ lower risk of new offense recommitment than matched controls, NS.
Saylor & Gaes (1992)	3 n = 4,731	.07	After 6 months, industry participants have fewer parole revocations (4.9%) than controls (6.6%), S.
		.13	After 12 months, industry participants have fewer parole revocations (6.6%) than controls (10.1%), S.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.
1= Approximate numbers based on survival analysis results.

**Studies of Correctional Industries and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Scores and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Anderson (1995a)	2 n = 18,068	.03 .06	After 2 years, correctional industry program completers had a lower rate of return to prison (28.7%) than those who participated but did not complete (30.1%) and those who did not participate (31.3%), NT.
Boudouris (1985)	2 n = 1,167	.41 .17	After 2 years, those with in-prison vocational, industry or farm work experience had fewer returns to prison (9%) ¹ than those with education alone (24%) ¹ , S. After 2 years, those with in-prison vocational, industry or farm work experience had fewer rearrests and revocations (30%) ¹ than those with education alone (38%) ¹ , S.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

1= Approximate numbers based on survival analysis results.

CHAPTER 4

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Studies of Vocational Education programs and Recidivism Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Bloom et al. (1994)	5 n = 198	-.07	After 36 months, male youth JTPA completers with prior arrests had a higher rate of recommitment (59.2%) than controls with prior arrests (55.7%), NR.
	n = 708	-.17	After 36 months, male youth JTPA completers with no prior arrests had higher arrest rates (25.8%) than controls with no prior arrests (18.7%), S.
	n = 1,153	-.07	After 36 months, female youth JTPA completers had higher arrest rates (7%) than controls (5.3%), NS.
Harer (1995a)	4 n = 1,205	NR	Education (including vocational) program participation significantly reduced the probability of being arrested or having parole revoked within 3 years of release. One course for each 6 months of prison term reduced recidivism 4.2% or, on average, 28.6% (one course) to 32.8% (no courses), S.
		.19 .30	Any education (including vocational) course completers (at least half of a course per 6 months) had fewer rearrests or parole revocations (30.1%) than those who completed less than half a course per 6 months (39%) and those who completed no courses (44.5%), S.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

- 1 = Mean or proportions for each group not reported.
2 = Recidivism event is undefined in this evaluation.

**Studies of Vocational Education programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Lattimore et al. (1990)	4 n = 184	.20	Vocational education participants had lower new crime reconviction rates (36%) than controls (46%), S.
Saylor & Gaes (1996)	3 n = 7,000+	NR	After a 8 to 12 year follow-up, vocational/training/apprenticeship participants have a lower risk of new offense recommitment than matched controls, S. ¹
		NR	After a 8 to 12 year follow-up, industry/training/ apprenticeship participants had a lower risk of new offense recommitment than matched controls, NS. ¹
Van Stelle et al. (1995)	3 n = 131	NR	After 6 months, STEP program graduates had higher average number of parole violations (M= 6) than controls (M= 1), S.
		-.12	After 9 months, STEP program graduates had more rearrests (24%) than controls (19%), NS.
		.14	After 9 months, STEP program graduates had fewer reincarcerations (22%) than controls (28%), NS.
Adams et al. (1994)	3 n = 14,411	.10	Vocational education (only) participants had fewer returns to prison (20.9%) than controls (25.1%), NS.
Downes et al. (1989)	3 n = 132	-.10	Vocational education participants had more unsuccessful parole outcomes (24%) than controls (20%), NS.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

1 = Means or proportions for each group not reported.

2 = Recidivism event is undefined in this evaluation.

Studies of Vocational Education programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
McGee (1997)	2 n = 1,525	.58	After an average follow-up period of three years, male vocational education program completers had fewer returns to prison (13.4%) than matched non-completers (38%), NT.
		.60	After an average follow-up period of three years, female vocational education program completers had fewer returns to prison (5%) than matched comparison non-completers (25%), NT.
		.73	After an average follow-up period of three years, vocational education program completers who were employed had fewer returns to prison (8.7%) than matched comparison non-completers (38%), NT.
Ryan (1997)	2 n = 642	.34	After a follow-up period ranging from 36 to 84 months, job training program participants had fewer "non-positive parole outcomes" (25%) than non participants (41%), S.
Piehl (1995)	2 n = 1,473	.11	Vocational and education program completers had lower recidivism ² (35%) than eligible controls (40.2%), S.
Anderson, S.V. (1995)	2 n = 18,068	.06	Vocational education completers (28.7%) had fewer returns to prison than controls (31.3%), NR.
Schumacker et al. (1990)	2 n = 760	.16	Vocational education participants had fewer parole violations (21%) than controls (28%), NR.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

CHAPTER 5 OTHER WORK PROGRAMS

Studies of Other Work Programs and Recidivism Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Uggen (1997)	5 n = 2,276	.00	After 3 years, employment program participants (43%) had same rearrest rates as controls (43%), NS.
		.10	After 2 years, young ex-offender participants had fewer rearrests (46%) than young ex-offender non-participants (51%), NS.
		.22	After 1 year, older ex-offender participants had fewer rearrests (26%) than older non participants (36%), S.
Clark et al. (1992)	5 n = 60	.21	Enhanced employment search program participants had lower rates of misconduct violations (56.7%) than matched controls (66.7%), NS.
		NR	Enhanced employment search program participants had fewer average number of misconduct violations (M = 1.03) than matched controls (M = 1.23), NS.
		NR	Enhanced employment search program participants had longer average time to first misconduct violation (M = 125.2) than matched controls (M = 81.8), S.
		.48	Enhanced employment search program participants had lower rates of return to prison (13.3%) than matched controls (33%), S.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Other Work Programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Turner & Petersilia (1996)	4 n = 218	.18	Work release participants had lower rearrest rates (22.3%) than controls (30.2%), NS.
		.02	Work release participants had lower reconviction rates (7.1%) than controls (7.6%), NS.
		-.37	Work release participants had higher "return to jail" rates (3.4%) than controls (0%), S.
		-.06	Work release participants had higher rates of return to prison for new crime (4.7%) than controls (3.6%), NS.
		-.87	Work release participants had higher rates of return to prison for violations (25.9%) than controls (1.0%), S.
Menon et al. (1992)	3 n = 12,000	.18	High risk employment program participants had fewer rearrests (48%) and reconvictions (23%) than high risk non-participants (57% rearrests, 38% reconvictions), S.
		.33	
		.05 .05	Low risk participants had fewer rearrests (16%) and reconvictions (0.6%) than comparisons (18% rearrests, 1% reconvictions), NT.
Latessa & Travis (1991)	3 n = 272	.03	Halfway house participants (with more services and employment assistance) had fewer new crime convictions (29.5%) than probation comparison non-participant subjects (30.7%), NS.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

Studies of Other Work Programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Milkman (1985)	3 n = 2,045	NR	<u>Average # Rearrests by City</u> Those who received program services and were placed in jobs had higher average number of rearrests, (Boston, M=.0145, NS; Chicago, M=.0133, NS) than comparisons (Boston, M=.0125; Chicago, M=.0125) in two sites and had a lower average number of rearrests (San Diego, M=.0098, NS) than comparisons (M=.0107) in one site.
		NR	Those who received program services and were placed in jobs had higher average number of "FBI Part I crime rearrests" (Boston, M=.0076, NS; Chicago, M=.0083, NS) than comparisons (Boston, M=.0072; Chicago, M=.0080) in two sites and had a lower average number of "FBI Part I crime rearrests" (San Diego, M=.0036, NS) than comparisons (M=.0054) in one site.
		NR	Those who received program services and were placed in jobs had higher average number of "income producing crime rearrests" in all cities (Boston, M=.0098, NS; Chicago, M=.0090, NS; San Diego, M=.0064, NS) than comparisons (Boston, M=.0083; Chicago, M=.0082; San Diego, M=.0061).
		NR	Those who were placed in jobs (experimental and comparison groups) had lower average number of rearrests in all cities (Boston, M=.067, NS; Chicago, M=.058, S; San Diego, M=.053, NS) than non-placed (Boston, M=.078; Chicago, M=.088; San Diego, M=.064).

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

Studies of Other Work Programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Milkman (1985) con't.	3 n = 2,045	NR	<u>Regression</u> Hours of program participation significantly reduced rearrest in Boston and San Diego, no effect in Chicago, S.
		NR	Hours of program participation significantly reduced "Income producing crime rearrests" in San Diego, no effect in other cities, S.
		NR	Hours of program participation had no significant effect on "FBI Part 1 crime rearrests" in any city, NS.
Washington State Work Ethic Camp (1995)	2 n = 101	NR	Work ethic camp (WEC) participants had a lower average number of "community custody inmate" violations per offender (M = 2.2) than controls (M = 2.9), NT.
		-.02	WEC participants had a higher rate of return to prison (25%) than controls (24%), NT.
		.00	WEC participants and controls were rearrested at the same rate (35%), NT.
Hartmann et al. (1994)	2 n = 156	.49	Halfway house employment program completers had lower rearrest rates (52%) than non-completers (75%), S.
		.51	Halfway house employment program completers had lower felony rearrest rates (44%) than non-completers (69%), S.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

CHAPTER 6 **COGNITIVE BEHAVIORAL THERAPY PROGRAMS:** **MORAL RECONATION THERAPY AND** **REASONING AND REHABILITATION**

Studies of Moral Reconciliation Therapy and Recidivism **Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Little et al. (1996)	3 n = 1,381	.30	MRT participants had a lower rate of reincarceration (41.2%) than the control group (56.2%), S.
		NR	MRT participants had fewer mean rearrests (M = 2.70) than control group (M = 3.37), NS.
		NR	MRT participants had fewer mean additional days of sentence (M = 793.1) than control group (M = 990.4), NT.
Little et al. (1995a)	3 n = 152	.31	MRT participants had a lower rate of reincarceration (44.3%) than the control group (59.8%), S.
Little et al. (1995b) Study 1	3 n = 152	.19	MRT participants had a lower rate of reincarceration (48.9%) than the control group (58.5%), S.
		.12	MRT participants had fewer rearrests (74.0%) than the control group (79%), NT.
Little et al. (1995b) Study 2	n = 180	.25	MRT participants had lower reincarceration rate (40.0%) than control group (52.3%), S.
		.27	MRT participants had fewer rearrests for any offense (61.0%) than control group (73.8%), NT.
		-.05	MRT participants had more rearrests for DWI offenses (31.3%) than control group (29.2%), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Moral Reconciliation Therapy and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Little et al. (1993a)	3 n = 180	.18	MRT participants had a lower rate of reincarceration (31.3%) than the control group (40%), NS.
Little et al. (1993b)	3 n = 152	.36	After five years, MRT participants had a lower rate of reincarceration (37.1%) than the control group (54.9%), S.
		.04	MRT participants received fewer additional days of sentence (M = 511) than control group (M = 550), NS.
		NR	After five years, MRT participants had fewer rearrests (M = 2.6) than control group (M = 2.8), NS.
		.09	After five years, fewer MRT participants had been rearrested (73%) than control group (77%), NT.
Little et al. (1994)	3 n = 1,381	.32	After five years, MRT participants had a lower rate of reincarceration (33.1%) than the control group (48.9%), S.
		.27	After five years, fewer MRT participants had been rearrested (65.5%) than the control group (77.8%), S.
		1.70	After five years, MRT participants received fewer mean additional days of sentence (M = 737) than the control group (M = 948), NS.
Burnett (1997)	2 n = 60	.28	MRT participants had fewer rearrests (10%) than control group (20%), NT.
		.64	MRT participants had a lower rate of reincarceration (0%) than control group (10%), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Moral Reconciliation Therapy and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Krueger (1997) Study 1	2 n = 7,128	.91	MRT participants had fewer rearrests (11%) than control group (51%), NT.
Study 2	n = 184	.45	MRT participants had fewer rearrests (45%) than control group (67%), S.
Study 3	n = 107	.88	MRT participants had fewer rearrests (62%) than control group (95%), S.
Little et al. (1991a)	2 n = 152	NR	MRT participants had fewer arrests per offender (M = 1.6) than the control group (M = 1.8), NT.
		.19	MRT participants had fewer arrests for any crime (61%) than control group (70%), NT.
		.27	MRT participants had a lower rate of reincarceration (24.3%) than the control group (36.6%), NT.
Little et al. (1991b)	2 n = 180	-.04 .01	After three years, MRT participants had more rearrests for DWI (18.3%) than control group (16.9%). Of a subset who participated in MRT and aftercare (n = 24), fewer were rearrested for DWI (16.7%), than control group (16.9%), NT.
		.33 .33	After three years, MRT participants had fewer rearrests for any offense including DWI/DWI (45.2%) than control group (61.5%). Of a subset who participated in MRT and aftercare (n = 24), fewer were rearrested for any crime (45.8%), than control group (61.5%), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Moral Reconciliation Therapy and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Little et al. (1991b), con't.		NR NR	After three years, MRT participants had a fewer average number of arrests ($M = 1.37$) than control group ($M = 1.42$). Of a subset who participated in MRT and aftercare ($n = 24$), there was a fewer average number of arrests ($M = 1.29$), than control group ($M = 1.42$), NT.
		.31 .46	After three years, MRT participants had a lower rate of reincarceration (22.6%) than control group (36.9%). Of a subset who participated in MRT and aftercare ($n = 24$), fewer were 16.7% were reincarcerated (16.7%) than control group (36.9%), NT.
		NR NR	After three years, MRT participants received more additional days of sentence ($M = 62.5$) than control group ($M = 54.8$). Of a subset who participated in MRT and aftercare ($n = 24$), fewer received additional days of sentence ($M = 34.6$) than control group ($M = 54.8$), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Moral Reconciliation Therapy and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Little et al. (1990)	2 n = 180	.15	MRT participants had fewer DWI or DWI rearrests (10.4%) than control group (15.4%), NT.
		.12	MRT participants had fewer rearrests other than DWI or DWI (31.3%) than control group (36.9%), NT.
		.83	MRT participants had fewer arrests for any crime (39.1%) than control group (78.5%), NT.
		.20	MRT participants had a lower rate of reincarceration (13.9%) than control group (21.5%), NT.
		NR	MRT participants had fewer days of additional jail days (M = 17.7) than the control group (M = 20.3), NT.
Little & Robinson (1989a)	2 n = 103	.28	MRT participants had a lower rate of reincarceration (7.8%) than control group (17%), NT.
Little & Robinson (1989c)	2 n = 180	.18	MRT participants had fewer rearrests for any crime (20%) than control group (27.6%), NT
		.07	MRT participants had fewer rearrests for alcohol-related charges (8.7%) than control group (10.8%), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Reasoning & Rehabilitation Programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Porporino & Robinson (1995)	4 n = 757	-.03	R&R participants had more reconviotions (15%) than control group (14%), NT.
		.11	R&R participants had fewer readmissions (32%) than control group (37%), S.
		.17	Among low-risk offenders, R&R participants had fewer reconviotions (7%) than control group (12%), NS.
		.27	Among low-risk offenders, R&R participants had fewer readmissions (21%) than control group (33%), S.
		-.19	Among high-risk offenders, R&R participants had more reconviotions (21%) than control group (14%), NT.
		.02	Among high-risk offenders, R&R participants had fewer readmissions (42%) than control group (41%), NT.
Ross et al. (1988)	4 n = 62	.64 1.09	R&R group had fewer reconviotions (18.1%) than either the group receiving life skills training (47.5%) or the control group (69.5%), NT.
		.68 1.16	R&R group had a lower rate of reincarcerations (0%) than either the life skills group (11%) or the control group (30%), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

Studies of Reasoning & Rehabilitation Programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Robinson (1995)	3 n = 2,125	.11	R&R completers had fewer readmissions (44.5%) and fewer reconvictions (19.7%) than the control group (50.1%, 24.8%), S.
		.12	
		.50	Among community-based programs, R&R completers had fewer readmissions (30.6%) and reconvictions (6.4) than the control group (50.1%, 24.8%), S.
		.53	
		.08	Among institutionally-based programs, R&R completers had fewer readmissions (45.9%), but more reconvictions (28.8%) than the control group (50.1%, 24.8%), NT.
		-.09	
		.26	Among violent offenders, R&R completers had fewer reconvictions (21.2%) than the control group (32.8%), NT.
		.34	Among sex offenders, R&R completers had fewer reconvictions (8.2%) than the control group (19.6%), NT.
		.31	Among drug offenders, R&R completers had fewer reconvictions (22.8%) than the control group (36.8%), NT.
		.04	Among nonviolent property offenders, R&R completers had fewer reconvictions (31%) than the control group (33%), NT.
		.07	Among robbery offenders, R&R completers had fewer reconvictions (27%) than the control group (30%), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Reasoning & Rehabilitation Programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Raynor & Vanstone (1996)	3 n = 271	.10 .08 .00 -.05 -.13	After 12 months, R&R participants had fewer reconvictions overall (44%) and fewer reconvictions for serious offenses (18%) than control group (49%, 21%), NT. After 24 months, R&R participants had the same number of reconvictions (65%) but more serious offenses (27%) than controls (65%, 25%) NT. Upon reconviction, more R&R participants received a prison term (20%) than controls (15%), NT.
Johnson & Hunter (1995)	3 n = 134	.07 .34 .53 1.33	Drug program participants receiving R&R had fewer revocations (26%) than participants who did not have R&R (29%) and regular probationers (42%), NT. Among high-risk offenders, R&R drug treatment participants had fewer revocations (14%) than drug treatment participants with no R&R (35%) and regular probationers (75%), NT.
Knott (1995)	3 n = 730	-.08 .10 -.21 .89 .33	At a 12 month follow-up, the R & R participants had more reconvictions (44%) than controls (40%), but compared to a subsample R & R completers, the reconviction rate was lower (35%) than controls, NT. R & R participants had a higher reincarceration rate (37%) than controls (27%), but compared to R & R completers, the incarceration rate was lower (0%) than controls, NT. R & R completers had fewer violent offense reconvictions (13%) than program dropouts (26%), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.
Studies of Reasoning & Rehabilitation Programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Knott (1995) con't.		.16	R&R completers had fewer reconvictions for burglary (13%) than program dropouts (19%), NT.
		.19	R&R completers had fewer reconvictions for theft (30%) than program dropouts (39%), NT.
		-.36	R&R completers had more reconvictions for drug offenses (17%) than program dropouts (6%), NT.
		-.85	R&R completers had more reconvictions for criminal damage (17%) than program dropouts (0%), NT.
		-.12	R&R completers had more reconvictions for other less serious offenses (14%) than program dropouts (10%), NT.
Porporino et al. (1991)	3 n = 63	.14	R&R participants had fewer readmitted to an institution (45%) than the control group (52.1%), NT.
		.24	R&R participants had fewer readmissions with new convictions (20%) than control group (30.4%), NT.
		-.08	R&R participants had more readmissions with no new convictions (25.0%) than control group (21.7%), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Reasoning & Rehabilitation Programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Robinson et al. (1991)	3 n = 63	.24	R&R participants has fewer readmissions (20%) than controls (30.4%), NT.
		.53	Among high-risk subjects, R&R participants had fewer readmissions with new convictions (18%) than control group (42%), NT.
		-.76	Among low-risk subjects, R&R participants had more readmissions with new convictions (16%) than control group (0%), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

CHAPTER 7: SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT

Studies of Prison-Based Sex Offender Treatment Programs and Recidivism Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Hanson et al. (1993)	4 n = 197	.08 -.23	Child molesters in the cognitive-behavioral treatment program had fewer reconvictions for sexual, violent, or both crimes (44%) than offenders who had previously completed the same treatment program (48%), but not compared to offenders who were sentenced to the same institution at the same time as the treatment group but, did not participate in treatment (33%), NS.
Nicholaichuk et al. (1995)	4 n = 579	.45 .06 .44 -.03	<p>High risk sex offenders in cognitive-behavioral treatment had fewer sex offense reconvictions (14.5%) than controls (33.2%), S.</p> <p>High risk sex offenders in a cognitive-behavioral treatment program had fewer non-sex offense reconvictions (32.1%) than non-participants (35.0%), NS.</p> <p>High risk sex offenders in cognitive-behavioral treatment had fewer sex offense reconvictions that resulted in a return to federal prison (6.1%) than program non-participants (20.5%), S.</p> <p>High risk sex offenders in cognitive-behavioral treatment had more non-sexual convictions that resulted in a return to federal prison (7.8%) than non-participants (7.1%), NS.</p>

CHAPTER 7: SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT

Studies of Prison-Based Sex Offender Treatment Programs and Recidivism Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Oregon Department of Corrections (1994)	2 n = 257	NR	Participants in intensive residential correctional treatment (6%) and those in outpatient correctional treatment (7%) had less reincarceration than nonparticipants, (individual group difference NR) NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Prison-Based Sex Offender Treatment Programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Song & Lieb (1995) Study 1	2 n = 278	.09	Sex offenders in a community-based treatment program had fewer sexual rearrests (11%) than offenders who did not participate in the treatment program but were eligible (14%), NS and offenders who did not participate in the treatment program and were not eligible (31%), S.
		.50	
		.45	
		.42	
Song & Lieb (1995) Study 2	2 n = 787	.51	Sex offenders in a community-based treatment program had fewer violent rearrests (2%) than offenders who did not participate in the treatment program but were eligible (13%), NS and offenders who did not participate in the treatment program and were not eligible (12%), NT.
		.67	Sex offenders in a community-based treatment program had fewer other felony rearrests (7%) than offenders who did not participate in the treatment program but were eligible (25%), S and offenders who did not participate in the treatment program and were not eligible (32%), NT.
		.03	Sex offenders in prison-based treatment had fewer sexual rearrests (11%) than non-participants (12%), NS.
		.15	Sex offenders in a prison-based treatment program had fewer violent rearrests (1%) than offenders not participating in the treatment program (3%), NS.
		.04	Sex offenders in a prison-based treatment program had fewer other felony rearrests (5%) than offenders not participating in the treatment program (6%), NS.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Prison-Based Sex Offender Treatment Programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Huot (1997)	2 n = 251	.14 .30 .17 .36 .18 .03	Sex offenders who completed the prison-based treatment program had fewer sexual offense rearrests (12%), person offense rearrests (6%), and any other offense rearrest (11%) than the offenders who never entered treatment (17%, 15%, 17%; respectively), S or who dropped out of treatment (26%, 11%, 11%, respectively), S.
Alaska Department of Corrections (1996)	2 n = 685	NR	Sex offenders in correctional center treatment had fewer rearrests (M= 4.4) than the treatment-motivated control group (M=4.9) NS; the unmotivated sex offender control group (M=4.7); and the non-sex offender control group (M = 7.0), NT.
Gordon & Nicholaichuk (1996)	2 n = 1,421	.07	Fewer sex offenders in a cognitive-behavioral treatment program had reconvictions for a sexual offense (4.7%) than the control group (6.2%), NS.
	n = 196	.19	Fewer sex offenders in cognitive-behavioral treatment had non-sexual reconvictions (7.8%) than the control group (13.6%), NS.
		.29	Of the sex offenders participating in the cognitive-behavioral treatment program, high-risk sex offenders had fewer of sexual reconvictions (6.0%) than the high-risk control group (14.6%), S.
		.19	Of the sex offenders participating in the cognitive-behavioral treatment program, high-risk sex offenders had fewer non-sexual reconvictions (8.6%) than the high-risk control group (14.6%), NS.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Non-Prison Based Sex Offender Treatment Programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Marques et al. (1994)	4 n = 602	.17 .14 .27 .04	Child molesters and adult rapists in a cognitive-behavioral treatment program had fewer sexual rearrests (8.3%) than offenders in the volunteer control group (13.4%), NS and the non-volunteer control group (12.5%), NS. Child molesters and adult rapists in cognitive-behavioral treatment had fewer other violent offenses (8.3%) than the volunteer control group (17.5%), NT and the non-volunteer control group (9.4%), NS.
Marshall & Barbaree (1988)	4 n = 126	.51	Fewer child molesters in cognitive-behavior treatment were rearrested or self-reported any sexual offenses (13.2%, M = 1.44), than the non-treatment comparisons (34.5%, M = 1.6 sexual reoffenses), S.
Marshall et al. (1991) Study 1	3 n = 44	.36	Exhibitionists participating in a treatment program intended to modify deviant sexual preferences were reconvicted or charged with a sexual offense less (39.1%) than untreated exhibitionists (57.1%), NS.
Study 2	3 n = 61	.70	Exhibitionists participating in a cognitive-behavioral sex offender treatment program were reconvicted or charged with a sexual offense less (23.6%) than the untreated exhibitionists (57.1%), S.
Rice et al. (1991)	2 n = 58	-.15	Child molesters in a behavioral treatment program had a higher proportion of sexual convictions (38%) than offenders not participating in the treatment program (31%), NS.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

CHAPTER 8: COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAMS FOR CHEMICALLY-DEPENDENT OFFENDERS

Studies of Programs for Chemically-Dependent Offenders Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Nemes, Wish, & Messina (1998)	5 n = 412	-.28 -.22 -.04 -.04 NR	Clients who attended the standard program (10 months inpatient, 2 months aftercare) had lower self-reported and official arrest, S; self-reported and official imprisonment, and longer average time until arrest after discharge than clients who attended the enhanced program, S (6 month inpatient, 6 month aftercare).
Latessa & Moon (1992)	5 n = 274	-.05 .03 -.19	<p>Participants in a chemical dependency program with an acupuncture component were more likely to be arrested (20%) than those in the control group (18%), NS.</p> <p>Participants in a chemical dependency program with an acupuncture component were less likely to be convicted (15%) than those in the control group (16%), NS.</p> <p>Participants in a chemical dependency program with an acupuncture component were more likely to probation revoked due to technical violation (70%) than those in the control group (61%), NS.</p>
Rhodes & Gross (1997)	5 n = 1,202	-.11 -.04 .03 .04	At 3-months, substance abuse case management clients had more self-reported criminal behavior in Washington DC (19%) and Portland (31%) than the control group (DC=15%; Portland =29%), but less than the referral group (DC=20%; Portland=33%), NS.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Programs for Chemically-Dependent Offenders
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Rhodes & Gross (1997), con't.	5 n = 1,202	.15	At 6-months, substance abuse case management clients had less self-reported criminal behavior in Washington, DC (10%) and Portland (22%) than those in the control group (DC=15%, S; Portland=27%, NS.) and those in the referral group (DC=17%, S; Portland=26%, NS).
		.12	
		.21	
		.09	
		.13	At 3-months, substance abuse case management clients were less likely to be jailed in Washington, DC (15%) than those in the control (20%) and referral groups (20%), S. Portland clients were more likely to be jailed (26%) than the control group (24%), but less likely to be jailed than the referral group (27%), NS.
		.13	
		-.05	
		.02	
		.12	At 6-months, substance abuse case management clients were less likely to be jailed in Washington, DC (18%) and Portland (23%) than those in the control (DC=23%, Portland=27%) and referral groups (DC=22%, Portland=27%), NS.
		.09	
		.10	
		.09	
		.09	At 3-month and 6-months, substance abuse case management clients were less likely to have their parole revoked in Washington, DC (3 month =12%, 6 month=18%) than those in the control groups (3 month=15%, 6 month=21%) and referral groups (3 month=17%, 6 month =27%), NS.
		.08	
		.14	
		.22	

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Programs for Chemically-Dependent Offenders
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Petersilia & Turner (1992)	5 n = 549	-.21	Drug offenders under intensive supervision were more likely to be arrested in Seattle (46.1%, S), Atlanta (11.5%), Santa Fe (48.3%), Macon, GA (42.3%), and Winchester, VA (28.9%, S) than those on routine parole/probation in Seattle (35.7%), Atlanta (4.2%), Santa Fe (27.6%), Macon (37.5%), and Winchester (12%) but ISP clients are less likely to be arrested in Des Moines (23.7%) and Waycross, GA (12.5%) than those on routine parole/probation in Des Moines (28.7%) and Waycross (15.4%), NS.
		-.28	
		-.43	
		-.10	
		-.43	
		.11	
		.08	
		-.19	Drug offenders under intensive supervision were more likely to technical violations in Seattle (33.7%,S), Des Moines (39%), Atlanta (65.4%), Waycross (25%), and Winchester (42.9%, S) than those on routine parole/probation in Seattle (25%), Des Moines (33.9%) Atlanta (45.8), Waycross (15.4%), and Winchester (20%) but ISP clients had less technical violations in Santa Fe (24.1%) and Macon (57.7%) than those on routine parole/probation in Santa Fe (34.5%) and Macon (62.5%) NS.
		-.11	
		-.40	
		-.24	
		-.50	
		.23	
		.10	

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Programs for Chemically-Dependent Offenders
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Anglin et al. (1996)	4 n = 1,671	NR	Clients who participated in the TASC programs in Birmingham, Canton, Chicago, and Portland had higher average numbers of incarceration days than the control group participants but clients participating in TASC programs in Orlando had a lower average number of incarceration days than those in the control group, NS.
		NR	Clients who participated in the TASC programs in Birmingham, Chicago, and Orlando had higher average numbers of property crimes than those in the control groups but participants of TASC programs in Canton and Portland had lower average number of property crimes than those in the control group, NS.
		NR	Clients who participated in the TASC programs in Canton, Orlando, and Portland (S) were more likely to be arrested than those in the control groups but participants of TASC programs in Birmingham and Chicago were less likely to be arrested than those in the control groups, NS.
		NR	Clients who participated in the TASC programs in Birmingham (S), Orlando and Portland were more likely to have their parole revoked than those in the control groups but participants of TASC programs in Canton and Chicago were less likely to have their parole revoked than those the control groups, NS.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Programs for Chemically-Dependent Offenders
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Martin et al. (1995)	3 n = 467	.73	Participants in prison and outpatient programs were less likely to be arrested (4%) than those in no treatment (29%), S.
		.50	Participants in prison and outpatient programs were less likely to be arrested (4%) than those in prison only treatment (19%), NR
		.45	Participants in prison and outpatient programs were less likely to be arrested (4%) than those in outpatient only treatment (17%), NR.
Prendergast et al. (1996)	3 n = 64	.85	Women participating in prison and outpatient programs (31.6%) had fewer custody returns than non-participants (72.8%), S.
		.33	Women participating in prison and outpatient programs (31.6%) had fewer custody returns than those in prison program only (47.8%), S.
Wexler et al. (1995)	3 n = 290	.76 .50 .35	Participants of the in-prison and aftercare treatment had lower rates of reincarceration (26.2 %) than those who received no treatment (63%), dropped out of the program (50%), and participated in the prison treatment only (42.9%), S.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Programs for Chemically-Dependent Offenders
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Finigan (1996)	2 n = 500	.47	Treatment completers of the outpatient drug and alcohol treatment program were less likely to be arrested (43%) than those noncompleters (66%), S.
		.31	Treatment completers of the outpatient drug and alcohol treatment program were less likely to be convicted (16%) than noncompleters (29%), S.
		.33	Treatment completers of the outpatient drug and alcohol treatment program were less likely to be incarcerated (6%) than noncompleters (12%), S.
		NR	Treatment completers of the outpatient drug and alcohol treatment program had lower average incarceration days (927 days per 100 clients) than noncompleters (2215 days per 100 clients), S.
Hiller et al. (1996)	2 n = 492	.08	Completers of the prison and outpatient components of the Step Down program were less likely to be arrested (5%) than those who were did not (7%), NS.
Oregon Department of Corrections (1994)	2 n = 1,890	NR	Fewer clients who participated in outpatient treatment were returned to prison than eligible non-participating comparisons, NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Programs for Chemically-Dependent Offenders
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Van Stelle et al. (1994)	2 n = 259	.64 .57 .20	Chemical dependency program completers had fewer rearrests (43%) than noncompleters (74%), S. Chemical dependency program completers had fewer convictions (42%) than noncompleters (70%), S. On average, chemical dependency program completers received shorter jail sentences (M=398 days) than noncompleters (M=605 days), NS.
Vito et al. (1993)	2 n = 1,664	.53	Those who completed program (3.8%) had lower reincarceration rates than those who didn't (19.9%), NT.
Martin et al. (1992)	2 n = 176	NR	Treatment completers were less likely to recidivate (arrested and reincarcerated) than those who did not, S.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Programs for Chemically-Dependent Offenders
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Field (1989)	2 n = 209	.73	Graduates of the Cornerstone program were less likely to be arrested (63%) than those who were in the program for less than 60 days (92%), between 2-6 months (88%), and more than 6 months (79%), NT.
		.60	
		.36	
		.91	Those who graduated from the Cornerstone program were less likely to be convicted (49%) than those who were in the program for less than 60 days (89%), between 2-6 months (76%), and more than 6 months (72%) NT.
		.57	
		.48	
		1.27	Those who graduated from the Cornerstone program were more likely to not be incarcerated (26%) than those who were in the program for less than 60 days (85%), between 2-6 months (67%), and more than 6 months (63%) NT.
		.85	
		.76	

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

CHAPTER 9 ANGER/STRESS MANAGEMENT

Anger Management Programs and Recidivism Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Faulkner et al. (1992) Study 1	2 n = 15	NR	Subjects completing treatment scored lower at post-treatment (M = 2.57) on the violent behavior inventory direct violence scale versus their pre-treatment scores (M = 5.64), S.
		NR	Subjects completing treatment scored lower at post-treatment (M = 0.64) on the Violent Behavior Inventory severe violence scale versus their pre-treatment scores (M = 2.71), S.
		NR	Subjects' spouses report lower scores for spouse at post-treatment (M = 5.37) on the Violent Behavior Inventory direct violence scale versus spouses' pre-treatment behaviors (M = 1.62), S.
		NR	Subjects' spouses report lower scores for spouse at post-treatment (M = 0.37) on the Violent Behavior Inventory severe violence scale versus spouses' pre-treatment behaviors (M = 3.12), S.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Anger Management Programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't.**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Faulkner et al. (1992) Study 2	2 n = 15	NR	Subjects completing treatment scored lower at post-treatment (M = 0.42) on the Violent Behavior Inventory direct violence scale versus their pre-treatment scores (M = 4.57), S.
		NR	Subjects completing treatment scored lower at post-treatment (M = 0.42) on the Violent Behavior Inventory severe violence scale versus their pre-treatment scores (M = 2.35), S.
		NR	Subjects' spouses report lower scores for spouse at post-treatment (M = 1.01) on the Violent Behavior Inventory direct violence scale versus spouses' pre-treatment behaviors (M = 4.33), S.
		NR	Subjects' spouses report lower scores for spouse at post-treatment (M = 0.13) on the Violent Behavior Inventory severe violence scale versus spouses' pre-treatment behaviors (M = 3.11), S.
Marquis et al. (1996) Sample 1	2 n = 216	.51	Offenders who completed substance abuse treatment (34%) and anger management treatment had less recidivism than those who did not receive any treatment (59%), S.
Marquis et al. (1996) Sample 2	2 n = 190	.55	Offenders who received anger management treatment only (33%) had less recidivism than those who did not receive any treatment (60%), S.
		.49	Offenders who received a combination of substance abuse and anger management (36%) had less recidivism than those who did not receive any treatment (60%), S.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

CHAPTER 10: VICTIM AWARENESS

Studies of Victim Awareness Programs and Recidivism Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Shinar & Compton (1995) California Study	3 n = 2,260	-.02	Victim impact panel (VIP) treatment group (13.5%) had more reoffending for all DWI incidents than the VIP control group (13.4%), NS.
		-.03	VIP treatment group (1.5%) had more reckless driving or hit and run offenses within one year than the VIP control group (1.2%), NS.
		-.02	After two years, VIP treatment group (2.1%) had more reckless driving or hit and run offenses than the VIP control group (1.8%), NS.
		.04	Offenders who completed a VIP (5.9%) had less incidents of DWI within one year after treatment than the VIP control group (6.9%), NS.
		.01	Offenders who completed VIP (11.5%) had less incidents of DWI for two years after treatment than the VIP control group (11.9%), NS.
		-.06	The VIP treatment group (2.3%) had more DWI or reckless crashes than the VIP control group (1.5%), NS.
		-.02	The VIP treatment group (3.5%) had more drinking/drug crashes than the VIP control group (3.2%), NS.
		.02	VIP completers had less misdemeanor DWIs (11.3%) than the VIP control group (12%), NS.
		.08	Offenders who completed a VIP (3.4%) had less incidents where license was suspended or revoked than the VIP control group (5%), NS.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Victim Awareness Programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Stutz (1994)	2 n = 150	NR	Offenders who completed the victim awareness education program (9.3%) had less reoffending than offenders who did not complete the treatment (37.3%), NT.
Shinar & Compton (1995) Oregon Study	2 n = 3,290	.10	In terms of all moving violations and crashes combined, offenders treated in the victim impact panel (VIP) had less recidivism (30.1%) than the VIP control group (35%), S.
		NR	At the one-year follow up, the VIP treatment group had less DWI violations and crashes (M = .1267) than the VIP control group (M = .1778), S.
		NR	At the full follow-up period (3-4 years), the VIP treatment group had less DWI violations and crashes (M = .3948) than the VIP control group (M = .4526), NS.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

CHAPTER 11 LIFE SKILLS TRAINING

Studies of Life Skills Training Programs and Recidivism Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Melton & Pennell (1998)	4 n = 335	NR	The life skills participants had fewer rearrests (M=.34) after program participation than before the program (M=.89), NS.
		NR	In a one year follow up, the life skills group had fewer rearrests (M=.34) than the control group (M=.37), NS.
		NR	The life skills participants had fewer reconvictions (M=.84) after program participation than before (M=1.8), NS.
		NR	In a one year follow up, the life skills participants had more reconvictions (M=.84) than the control group (M=.79), NS.
Ross et al. (1988)	4 n = 62	-.64	The life skills participants were more likely to be reconvicted following treatment (47.5%) than the cognitive skills group (18.1%), NT.
		.45	The life skills participants were less likely to be reconvicted following treatment (47.5%) than the probation only group (69.5%), NT.
		-.68	The life skills group was more likely to receive sentences of imprisonment following treatment (11%) than the cognitive skills group (0%), NT.
		.48	The life skills participants were less likely to receive sentences of imprisonment following treatment (11%) than the probation only group (30%), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

**Studies of Life Skills Training Programs and Recidivism
Showing Scientific Methods Score and Findings, con't**

Evaluation Study Reviewed	Methods Score & No. of cases	Effect Size	Evaluation Study Findings
Miller (1997)	3 n = 179-349	.19	In a one year follow up, the life skills participants from the first stage of the program had fewer rearrests (19.1%) than the control group (27.1%), NS.
		.12	In a one year follow up, the life skills participants had fewer reconviptions and pending charges (21.5%) than the control group (26.8%), NT.
		-.004	In a one year follow up, the life skills participants were more likely to have pending charges or reconviptions for violent offenses (5.5%) than the control group (5.4%), NT.
Miller (1995)	3 n = 79	.26	The life skills participants had fewer rearrests (8.2%) during the six month follow up than the control group (16.7%), NT.
Austin (1997)	2 n = 917	.10	Fewer life skills graduates were recommitted to Dauphin County Prison (DCP) (44%) than the control group (49%), NT.
		.29	Of those returned to DCP, fewer life skills graduates were returned for a new offense (22.6%) than the control group (35.8%), NT.

Note: NS = nonsignificant, S = significant, NT = no statistical test, NR = not reported.

APPENDIX C: CHAPTER REFERENCES

CHAPTER 1: EVALUATION RESEARCH AND PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Andrews, D.A. Bonta, J., & Hoge, I. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17, 19-52.

Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (1994). The Psychology of Criminal Conduct. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.

Andrews, D.A., Zingler, I., Hoge, R.D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F.T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically-relevant and psychologically-informed meta-analysis. Criminology, 28: 369-404.

Bailey, Walter C. (1966). Correctional outcome: An evaluation of 100 reports. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology and Police Science, 57 (2).

Cohen, J. (1977). Statistical Power for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Academic.

Cullen, F.T. , & Gendreau, P. (1989). The effectiveness of correctional rehabilitation: Reconsidering the "Nothing Works" debate. In L. Goodstein & D. Mackenzie (Eds.). The American Prison: Issues in Research and Policy. New York: Plenum Press.

Cullen, F. T. & Gilbert, K. E. (1982). Reaffirming Rehabilitation. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson publishing, Co.

Gendreau, P, Little, T, & Goggin, C. (1995). A Meta-Analysis of the Predictors of Adult Offender Recidivism: What Works! University of New Brunswick, St. John, Canada. Unpublished manuscript.

Gendreau, P. (1981). Treatment in corrections: Martinson was wrong. Canadian Psychology, 22, Tonry, M., & Lynch, M. (1996). Intermediate sanctions. In M. Tonry. (Ed.). Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, Vol.20. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Gendreau, P & Ross , R. R. (1979). Effective correctional treatment: Bibliotherapy for cynics. Crime and Delinquency, 25 : 463-489.

Gendreau, P & Ross , R. R. (1981). Correctional potency: Treatment and deterrence on trial. In R. Roesch & R. Corrado (Eds) Evaluation Research and Policy in Criminal Justice. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Gendreau, P. & Ross, R. R. (1987). Revivification of rehabilitation: Evidence from the 1980's. Justice Quarterly, 4: 349-407.

- Gerstein, D.R. & Harwood, H.J. (1992). Treating Drug Problems. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Gottfredson, M.R. (1979). Parole guidelines and reduction of sentence disparity. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 16:218-31.
- Greenwood, P & Zimring, F. E. (1985). One More Chance: The Pursuit of Promising Intervention Strategies for Chronic Juvenile Offenders. Santa Monica, CA: Sage Publications.
- Halleck, S & Witte, A. E. (1977). Is rehabilitation dead? Crime and Delinquency: 372-382.
- Kirby, B.C. (1954). Measuring effects of treatment of criminals and delinquents. Sociology and Social Research. 38: 368-374.
- Lab, S.P., & Whitehead, J.T. (1988). An analysis of juvenile correctional treatment . Crime and Delinquency, 34: 60-83.
- Lipsey, M. (1992). Juvenile delinquency treatment: a meta-analytic inquiry into the variability of effects. In T. Cook, et al. (Eds.). Meta-analysis For Explanation: A Casebook. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lipton, D., Martinson, R., & Wilks, J. (1975). The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment: A Survey of Treatment Evaluation Studies. New York: Praeger.
- Lipton, D. And Pearson, F.S. (1996). The CDATE Project: Reviewing Research on the Effectiveness of Treatment Programs for Adult and Juvenile Offenders. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Chicago, Il.
- Logan, C. (1972). Evaluation research in crime and delinquency: An reappraisal. Journal of Criminal Law Criminology, and Police Science, 63: 378-387.
- Martin, S., Sechrest, L., & Redner. (Eds) (1981). New Directions in the Rehabilitation of Criminal Offenders. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Martinson, R (1974). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. The Public Interest, 10 :22-54.
- Palmer, T. (1975). Martinson revisited. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 12:133-152.
- Palmer, T (1983). The effectiveness issue today: An overview. Federal Probation, 46 : 3-10.
- Sechrest, L., White, S., & Brown, E (1979). The Rehabilitation of Criminal Offenders: Problems and Prospects. Washington, D.C.: The National Academy of Science.

Sherman, L.W. (1992). Policing Domestic Violence: Experiments and Dilemmas. New York: Free Press.

Sherman, L.W., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D.L., Eck, J., Reuter, P., & Bushway, S. (1997). Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising. National Institute of Justice: Washington, D.C.

Stojkovic, S. (1994). The President's crime commission recommendations for corrections: The twilight of idols. In J. Conley (Ed.), The 1967 President's Crime Commission Report: Its Impact 25 Years Later (pp.37-55). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Tonry, M., & Lynch, M. (1996). Intermediate sanctions. In M. Tonry. (Ed.). Crime and Justice: A Review of Research. Vol.20. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Tonry, M. (1996). Sentencing Matters. (pp.72-99). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Van Voorhis (1987). Correctional effectiveness: The high cost of ignoring success. Federal Probation, 51 (1): :56-62.

Walker, S. 1985. Sense and Nonsense About Crime: A Policy Guide. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Whitehead, J.T., & Lab, S.P. (1989). A meta-analysis of juvenile correctional treatment. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 26, 276-295.

Wolf, F.M. (1986). Meta-Analysis: Quantitative Methods for Research Synthesis. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

CHAPTER 2: ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Adams, K., Bennett, T., Flanagan, T.J., Marquart, J., Cuvelier, S., Fritsch, E.J., Gerber, J., Longmire, D., & Burton, V. (1994). A large-scale multidimensional test of the effect of prison education programs on offender behavior. The Prison Journal, 74: 433-449.

Andrews, D.A. & Bonta, J. (1994). Psychology of Criminal Conduct. Anderson Publishing Co: Cincinnati, Ohio.

Barton, P.E. & Coley, R.J. (1996). Captive Students: Education and Training in America's Prisons. Policy Information Center: Princeton, NJ.

Cogburn, H.E. (1992). Recidivism Study: Positive Termination from J.F. Ingram State Technical College 1976-1986. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report Exhibit IV: Washington, DC.

- Correctional Education School Authority Planning, Research, and Evaluation (1990). Academic and Vocational Program Completers Released from Prison During Fiscal Year 1986-1988 : Employment, Recidivism, and Cost Avoidance. Author: Tallahassee, FL.
- Fabelo, T. (1992). Evaluation of the Reading to Reduce Recidivism Program. Texas Criminal Justice Policy Council: Austin, TX.
- Flanagan, T.J., Adams, K., Burton, S., Gerber, J., Longmire, D., Marquart, J., Bennett, K., & Fritsch, E.J. (1994). Prison Education Research Project. Sam Houston State University, Criminal Justice Center: 1-55.
- Gerber, J. & Fritsch, E.J. (1995). Adult academic and vocational correctional programs: A review of recent research. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 22(1/2): 119-142.
- Glaser, G. (1964). The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Harer, M.D. (1995a). Recidivism among federal prisoners released in 1987. Journal of Correctional Education, 46: 98-127.
- Harer, M.D. (1995b). Prison Education Program Participation and Recidivism : A Test of the Normalization Hypothesis. Federal Bureau of Prisons, Office of Research and Evaluation: Washington, DC.
- Hull, K.A. (1995). Analysis of Recidivism Rates for Participants of the Academic/Vocational/ Transition Education Programs Offered by the Virginia Department of Correctional Education. Virginia Department of Corrections: Richmond, VA.
- Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. Public Interest, 10: 22-54.
- New York State Department of Correctional Services (1992). Overview of Department Follow-up Research on Return Rates of Participants in Major Programs - 1992. Department of Correctional Services: Albany, NY.
- Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (1995). Evaluation of the Impact of Correctional Education Programs on Recidivism. Dept. of Rehabilitation and Correction.
- Piehl, A.M. (1995). Learning While Doing Time. John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University: Cambridge, MA.
- Porporino, F.J. & Robinson, R. (1992). The correctional benefits of education : A follow-up of Canadian federal offenders participating in ABE. Journal of Correctional Education, 43(2): 92-98.

Ramsey, C. (1988). The Value of Receiving a General Education Development Certificate While Incarcerated in the South Carolina Department of Corrections On the Rate of Recidivism. South Carolina Department of Corrections.

Reagan, M.V. and Stoughton, D.M. (1976). A Descriptive Overview of Correctional Education in the American Prison System. The Scarecrow Press, Inc : Metuchen, New Jersey.

Ryan, T.A. & McCabe, K.A. (1994). Mandatory versus voluntary prison education and academic achievement. The Prison Journal, 74: 450-461.

Ryan, T.A. & Maudlin, B.J. (1994). Correctional Education and Recidivism: An Historical Analysis.

Saden, S.J. (1962). Correctional Research at Jackson Prison. Journal of Correctional Education, 15 (October), 22-26.

Schumacker, R.E., Anderson, D.B., & Anderson, S.L. (1990). Vocational and academic indicators of parole success. Journal of Correctional Education, 41: 8-12.

Schnur, A. (1948). The Educational Treatment of Prisoners and Recidivism. American Journal of Sociology, 54, 142-147.

Siegal, G.R. & Basta, J. (1997). The Effect of Literacy and General Education Development Programs on Adult Probationers. Adult Probation Department of the Superior Court of Pima County: Pima, AZ.

Sigmund, A. (1993). What Works? A Review of the Correctional Literature on Program Effectiveness. Oregon Department of Corrections, Community Service Branch: Salem, OR.

Texas Youth Commission (1993). The Relationship Between GED Attainment and Recidivism. Texas Department of Research and Planning.

Tracy, C. & Johnson, C. (1994). Three Year Outcome Study of the Relationship Between Participation in Windham School System Programs and Reduced Levels of Recidivism. Texas Department of Criminal Justice: Huntsville, TX.

Walsh, A. (1985). An evaluation of the effects of adult basic education on rearrest rates among probationers. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation, 9: 69-76.

CHAPTER 3: CORRECTIONAL INDUSTRIES

- Anderson, S.V. (1995a). Evaluation of the Impact of Participation in Ohio Penal Industries on Recidivism. Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Office of Management Information Systems.
- Boudouris, J. (1985). Recidivism and Rehabilitation. Iowa Department of Corrections. Des Moines, IA.
- Clasby, R. (1996). Recidivism Rates and UCI Participation. Utah Correctional Industries.
- Christ, D. (1996). Employment/Recidivism Survey. MINNCOR: Minnesota Department of Corrections, Industry Division, Minneapolis, MN.
- Correctional Industries Association (personal communication, January, 1998.)
- Flanagan, T.J., Thornberry, T.P., Maguire, K., & McGarrell, E. (1988). The Effect of Prison Industry Employment on Offender Behavior: Report of the Prison Industry Research Project. Albany, NY: Hindelang Criminal Justice Research Center.
- Henry, P. (1988). Effects of Private Industry Participation on Inmates Adjustment Experiences Before and After Release. St. Petersburg, FL: Department of Sociology, Eckerd College.
- Maguire, K.E., Flanagan, T.J., & Thornberry, T.P. (1988). Prison labor and recidivism. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 4(1), 3-18.
- Motiuk, L. & Belcourt, R. (1996). CORCAN participation and post release recidivism. Forum on Correctional Research, 8(1), 15-17.
- Pride Enterprises. (1997). Annual Report. Pride Enterprises, St. Petersburg, FL.
- Saylor, W.G., & Gaes, G.G. (1992). PREP Study Links UNICOR Work Experience With Successful Post-Release Outcome. U.S. Federal Bureau of Prisons, Washington, DC.
- Saylor, W.G., & Gaes, G.G. (1996). PREP: Training Inmates Through Industrial Work Participation and Vocational and Apprenticeship Instruction. U.S. Federal Bureau of Prisons, Washington, DC.

CHAPTER 4: VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

- Adams, K., Bennett, T., Flanagan, T.J., Marquart, J., Cuvelier, S., Fritsch, E.J., Gerber, J., Longmire, D., & Burton, V. (1994). A large scale multidimensional test of the effect of prison education programs on offenders' behavior. The Prison Journal, 74: 433-449.

- Anderson, S.V. (1995b). Evaluation of the Impact of Correctional Education Programs on Recidivism. Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.
- Baker, S., & Sadd, S. (1979). The Court Employment Project Evaluation, Final Report. Vera Institute of Justice: New York, NY.
- Beck, J.L. (1986). Evaluation of Prison Programs Designed to Increase the Employability of Federal Offenders: A Review of Literature, Vocational Training Evaluation, Project Report One. Federal Bureau of Prisons, Washington DC.
- Berk, R.A., Lenihan, K.J., & Rossi, P.H. (1980). Crime and poverty: Some experimental evidence from ex-offenders. American Sociological Review, 45: 766-786.
- Bloom, H., Orr, L.L., Cave, G., Bell, S.H., Doolittle, F., & Lin, W. (1994). The National JTPA Study: Overview of Impacts, Benefits, and Costs of Title IIA. ABT Associates: Cambridge, MA.
- Bushway, S., & Reuter, P. (1997). Labor markets and crime risk factors. In L.W. Sherman, et al., Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising. Office of Justice Programs, Research Report.
- Coburn, D.S. (1987). Rate of Recidivism of Those Students That Have Completed Both a G.E.D. and Vocational Education Programs. Arkansas Department of Correction School District, Little Rock, AR.
- Craig, D.E., & Rogers, R.D. (1993). Vocational training in prison: A case study of maximum feasible misunderstanding. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 20(1-2): 1-20.
- Downes, E.A., Monaco, K.R., & Schreiber, S.O. (1989). Evaluating the effects of vocational education on inmates: A research model and preliminary results. The Yearbook of Correctional Education: 249-262.
- Freeman, R. B. (1992). Crime and the employment of disadvantaged youths. In Peterson, G., & Vroman, W. (Eds.) Urban Labor Markets and Job Opportunity. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Gainous, F.J. (1991). Alabama Correctional Education Research. Alabama Department of Post-Secondary Education, Mobile, AL.
- Gendreau, P. (1993). Principles of Effective Intervention with Offenders. University of New Brunswick.
- Gerber, J., & Fritsch, E.J. (1993). Prison Education and Offender Behavior: a Review of the Scientific Literature. Texas Dept. Of Criminal Justice.

- Green, T.M., Richmond, J.B., & Taira, J.E. (1993). The POWER Program: Providing Opportunities For Work, Education and Readiness. Final Evaluation Report. U.S. Dept. of Education, Washington, DC.
- Harer, M.D. (1995a). Recidivism among federal prisoners released in 1987. Journal of Correctional Education, 46: 98-127.
- Home Builders Institute. (1996). Project TRADE. A Program of Training, Restitution, Apprenticeship, Development and Education. Home Builders Institute, Washington, DC.
- Hull, K.A. (1995). Analysis of Recidivism Rates for Participants of the Academic/Vocational/Transition Education Programs Offered By the Virginia Dept of Correctional Education. Virginia Department of Correctional Education.
- Jenkins, H.D., Steurer, S.J., & Pendry, J. (1995). A post release follow-up of correctional education program completers released in 1990-1991. Journal of Correctional Education, 46(1): 20-24.
- Johnson, C.M. (1984). The Effects of Prison Labor Programs on Post-release Employment and Recidivism. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University.
- Lattimore, P.K., Witte, A.D, & Baker, J.R. (1990). Experimental assessment of the effect of vocational training on youthful property offenders. Evaluation Review, 14(2): 115-133.
- Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services. (1989). Implementation of a System to Measure Recidivism and Statistical Information on Recidivism. National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC.
- McGee, C. (1997). The Positive Impact of Corrections Education on Recidivism and Employment. Illinois Department of Corrections School District 428.
- Piehl, A.M. (1995). Learning While Doing Time: Prison Education and Recidivism Among Wisconsin Males. Princeton University.
- Ryan, T.P. (1997). A Comparison of Recidivism Rates For Operation Outward Reach (OOR) Participants and Control Groups of Non-Participants For the Years 1990 Through 1994. Program Evaluation Report. Operation Outward Reach, Inc., Youngwood, PA.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Saylor, W. & Gaes, G. (1996). PREP: Training Inmates through Industrial Work Participation, and Vocational and Apprenticeship Instruction. U.S. Federal Bureau of Prisons.

- Schumacker, R.E., Anderson, D.B., & Anderson, S.L. (1990). Vocational and academic indicators of parole success. Journal of Correctional Education, 41(1): 8-12.
- Tracey, C., & Johnson, C. (1994a). Three Year Outcome Study of the Relationship Between Participation in Windham School System Programs and Reduced Levels of Recidivism. Windham School System, Austin TX.
- Tracey, C., & Johnson, C. (1994b). Review of Various Outcome Studies Relating Prison Education to Reduced Recidivism. Windham School System, Austin TX.
- Van Stelle, K.R., Lidbury, J.R., & Moberg, D.P. (1995). Final Evaluation Report, Specialized Training and Employment Project (STEP). Wisconsin Department of Corrections. Center for Health Policy and Program Evaluation.
- Ward, D.A., & Tittle, C.R. (1994). IQ and delinquency: A test of two competing explanations. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 10, 189-212.
- Winterton, J.L. (1995). Transformations: Technology Boot Camp. Summative Evaluation. New Hampshire Department of Corrections.
- Wolfgang, M.E., Figlio, R., & Sellin, T. (1972). Delinquency in a Birth Cohort. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

CHAPTER 5: OTHER WORK PROGRAMS

- Campbell, J. (1996). McNeil Island Work Ethic Camp: Innovations in Boot Camp Reform. In Juvenile and Adult Boot Camps, p 185-199. American Correctional Association: Lanham, MD.
- Clark, P., Hartter, S., & Ford, E. (1992). An Experiment in Employment of Offenders. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology. New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Gray, D., & Wren, G. (1996). Pre-Release at South Idaho Correctional Institution: "Something Works." National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC.
- Hartmann, D.J., Friday, P.C., & Minor, K.I. (1994). Residential probation: a seven-year follow-up of halfway house discharges. Journal of Criminal Justice, 22(6), 503-515.
- Latessa, E.J., & Travis, L.F. (1991). Halfway house or probation: A comparison of alternative dispositions. Journal of Crime and Justice, 14, 53-75.
- MacKenzie, D.L. (1997). Criminal justice and crime prevention. In Sherman L.W., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D.L., Eck, J., Reuter, P., & Bushway, S. et al., Preventing

Crime: What Work's, What Doesn't, What's Promising. National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC.

Maguire, K., Flanagan, T., & Thornberry, T. (1988) Prison Labor and Recidivism. Journal of Quantitative Criminology 4 (1). 3-18.

Menon, R., Blakely, C., Carmichael, D., & Silver, L. (1992). An Evaluation of Project RIO Outcomes: An Evaluative Report. Public Policy Resources Laboratory.

Milkman, R.H. (1985). Employment Services for Ex-Offenders Field Test- Detailed Research Results. McLean, VA: Lazar Institute.

Sherman, L.W. (1997). Communities and crime prevention. In Sherman L.W., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D.L., Eck, J., Reuter, P., & Bushway, S. et al., Preventing Crime: What Work's, What Doesn't, What's Promising. National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC.

Sherman, L.W., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D.L., Eck, J., Reuter, P., & Bushway, S. (1997). Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising. National Institute of Justice: Washington, D.C.

Turner, S., & Petersilia, J. (1996). Work release in Washington: Effects on recidivism and corrections costs. Prison Journal, 76(2): 138-164.

Uggen, C. (1997). Age, Employment and the Duration Structure of Recidivism: Estimating the "True Effect" of Work on Crime. Paper delivered at the 1997 American Society of Criminology meeting. San Diego, CA.

Washington State Department of Corrections. (1995). Work Ethic Camp: One Year After (1993-1994). Program Report. Washington State Department of Corrections.

CHAPTER 6: COGNITIVE BEHAVIORAL THERAPY PROGRAMS: MORAL RECONATION THERAPY AND REASONING AND REHABILITATION

Arbuthnot, J., & Gordon, D.A. (1988). Crime and cognition: Community applications of sociomoral reasoning development. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 15, 379-393.

Blasi, A. (1980). Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 88, 1-45.

Burnett, W.L. (1997). Treating post-incarcerated offenders with Moral Reconation Therapy®: A one-year recidivism study. Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Review, 6(½), 2.

Fabiano, E.A., Porporino, F.J., & Robinson, D. (1991). Canada's cognitive skills program corrects offenders faulty thinking. Corrections Today, 53, 102-108.

- Gendreau, P., & Ross, R.R. (1981). Offender rehabilitation: The appeal of success. Federal Probation, 45, 45-48.
- Godwin, G., Stone, S., & Hambrock, K. (1995). Recidivism study: Lake County, Florida Detention Center. Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Review, 4(3), 6.
- Johnson, G., & Hunter, R.M. (1995). Evaluation of the Specialized Drug Offender Program. In Ross, R.R., & Ross, B. (Eds.). Thinking Straight. Ottawa: Cognitive Center.
- Knott, C. (1995). The STOP Programme: Reasoning and Rehabilitation in a British setting. In McGuire, J. (Ed.). What Works: Reducing Reoffending: Guidelines from Research and Practice. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Krueger, S. (1997). Five-year recidivism study of MRT®-treated offenders in a county jail. Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Review, 6, 3.
- Little, G.L., & Robinson, K.D. (1988). Moral reconnection therapy: A systematic step-by-step treatment system for treatment resistant clients. Psychological Reports, 62, 135-151.
- Little, G.L., & Robinson, K.D. (1989a). Effects of moral reconnection therapy upon moral reasoning, life purpose, and recidivism among drug and alcohol offender. Psychological Reports, 64, 83-90.
- Little, G.L., & Robinson, K.D. (1989b). Relationship of DWI recidivism to moral reasoning, sensation seeking, and MacAndrew alcoholism scores. Psychological Reports, 65, 1171-1174.
- Little, G.L., & Robinson, K.D. (1989c). Treating drunk drivers with moral reconnection therapy: A one-year recidivism report. Psychological Reports, 64, 960-962.
- Little, G.L., Robinson, K.D., & Burnette, K.D. (1990). Treating drunk drivers with moral reconnection therapy: A two-year follow-up. Psychological Reports, 66, 1379-1387.
- Little, G.L., Robinson, K.D., & Burnette, K.D. (1991a). Treating drug offenders with moral reconnection therapy: A three-year recidivism report. Psychological Reports, 69, 1151-1154.
- Little, G.L., Robinson, K.D., & Burnette, K.D. (1991b). Treating drunk drivers with moral reconnection therapy: A three-year report. Psychological Reports, 69, 953-954.
- Little, G.L., Robinson, K.D., & Burnette, K.D. (1993a). 42 month alcohol treatment data: Multiple DWI offenders treated with MRT show lower recidivism rates. Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Review, 2(3), 5.
- Little, G.L., Robinson, K.D., & Burnette, K.D. (1993b). Cognitive behavioral treatment of felony drug offenders: A five-year recidivism report. Psychological Reports, 73, 1089-1090.

- Little, G.L., Robinson, K.D., & Burnette, K.D. (1994). Treating offenders with cognitive-behavioral therapy: Five-year recidivism outcome data on MRT. Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Review, 3(2-3), 1-3.
- Little, G.L., Robinson, K.D., Burnette, K.D., & Swan, S. (1995a). Seven-year recidivism of felony offenders treated with MRT. Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Review, 4(3), 6.
- Little, G.L., Robinson, K.D., Burnette, K.D., & Swan, S. (1995b). Six-year MRT recidivism data on felons and DWI offenders: Treated offenders show significantly lower reincarceration. Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Review, 4(1), 1, 4-5.
- Little, G.L., Robinson, K.D., Burnette, K.D., & Swan, E.S. (1996). Review of Outcome Data With MRT: Seven Year Recidivism Results. Cognitive Behavioral Treatment Review, 5(1), 1-7.
- Mahoney, M.J., & Lyddon, W.J. (1988). Recent developments in cognitive approaches to counseling and psychotherapy. The Counseling Psychologist, 16, 190-234.
- MacPhail, D.D. (1989). The moral education approach in treating adult inmates. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 16, 81-97.
- MacKenzie, D.L., Gaston, A., & Souryal, C. (1997). Life Skills Program for Prisoners: Program Development and Experimental Evaluation. Evaluation Research Group, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of Maryland.
- Porporino, F.J., Fabiano, E.A., & Robinson, D. (1991). Focusing on Successful Reintegration: Cognitive Skills Training for Offenders, R-19. Research and Statistics Branch, The Correctional Service of Canada.
- Porporino, F.J., & Robinson, D. (1995). An evaluation of the Reasoning and Rehabilitation program with Canadian federal offenders. In Ross, R.R., & Ross, B. (Eds.). Thinking Straight. Ottawa: Cognitive Center.
- Raynor, P., & Vanstone, M. (1996). Reasoning and Rehabilitation in Britain: The results of the Straight Thinking on Probation (STOP) programme. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 40, 272-284.
- Robinson, D. (1995). The Impact of Cognitive Skills Training on Post-Release Recidivism Among Canadian Federal Offenders. Research Report, Correctional Research and Development, Correctional Service Canada.
- Robinson, D., Grossman, M., & Porporino, F. (1991). Effectiveness of the Cognitive Skills Training Program: From Pilot to National Implementation, B-07. The Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Service of Canada.

Ross, R.R., & Fabiano, E.A. (1985). Time to Think: A Cognitive Model of Delinquency Prevention and Offender Rehabilitation. Johnson City, TN: Institute of Social Sciences and Arts.

Ross, R.R., Fabiano, E.A., & Ewles, C.D. (1988). Reasoning and Rehabilitation. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 32, 29 - 36.

CHAPTER 7: SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT

Alaska Department of Corrections. (1996). Sex Offender Treatment Program: Initial Recidivism Study. Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit Justice Center. University of Alaska Anchorage.

Barbaree, H. (1997). Evaluating treatment efficacy with sexual offenders: the insensitivity of recidivism studies to treatment effects. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 9: 111-128.

Berlinger, L., Schram, D., Miller, L. L. & Milloy, C. D. (1995). Sentencing alternative for sex offenders: A study of decision-making and recidivism. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10: 487-502

Bingham, J.E., Turner, B.W., Piotrowski, C. (1995). Treatment of sexual offenders in an outpatient community- based program. Psychological Reports, 76: 1195-1200.

Blanchette, K. (1996). Sex Offender Assessment, Treatment and Recidivism: A Literature Review. Correctional Services of Canada.

Dizon, J. (1994). Evaluation of the sex offender treatment program at Twin Rivers Corrections Center. Phase I: A retrospective study. Washington State Department of Corrections.

Dwyer, S. M. & Myers, S. (1990). Sex offender treatment: A six-month to ten year follow-up study. Annals of Sex Research, 3: 305-318.

Furby, L., Weinrott, M. R., & Blackshaw, L. (1989). Sex offender recidivism: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 105: 3-30.

Gordon, A. & Nicholaichuk, T. (1996). Applying the Risk Principle To Sex Offender Treatment. Forum on Corrections Research Home Page: Managing Sex Offenders. <http://198.103.98.138/crd/forum/e082/e0821.htm>

Hanson, R. K., Steffy, R. A. & Gauthier, R. (1993). Long-term recidivism of child molesters. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 61: 646-652.

Huot, S. (1997). Sex Offender Treatment and Recidivism. Minnesota Department of Corrections. A Research Summary.

- Lang, R. A., Pugh, G. M. & Langevin, R. (1988). Treatment of incest and pedophilic offenders: A pilot study. Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 6: 239-255.
- Marques, J. K., Day, D. M. & West, M. (1994). Effects of cognitive-behavioral treatment on sex offender recidivism. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 21: 28-34.
- Marshall, W. L. & Barbaree, H. E. (1988). The long-term evaluation of a behavioral treatment program for child molesters. Behavior Research & Therapy, 26: 499-511.
- Marshall, W. L., Eccles, A. & Barbaree, H. E. (1991). The treatment of exhibitionists: A focus on sexual deviance versus cognitive and relationship features. Behavior Research & Therapy, 29: 129-135.
- Marshall, W. L., Jones, R., Ward, T. Johnston, P., & Barbaree, H.E. (1991). Treatment outcome with sex offenders. Clinical Psychology Review, 11: 465-485.
- Nicholaichuk, T., Gordon, A., Andre, G., Gu, D. (1995). Long-term Outcome of the Clearwater Sex Offender Treatment. Presented to the 14th Annual Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers: New Orleans.
- Nagayama Hall, G. C. (1995). Sexual offender recidivism revisited: A meta-analysis of recent treatment studies. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 63: 802-809.
- Norris, C. (1992). Sex Offender Treatment: Confronting "thinking errors" is central to success. Federal Prisons Journal. Winter: 29-31.
- Oregon Department of Corrections. (1994). Comparison of Outcomes and Costs Residential and Outpatient Treatment Programs for Inmates: CTP and CTS Evaluation of Outcomes and Cost. Executive Summary, Oregon Department of Corrections: Salem, OR.
- Porporino, F. J. & Nouwens, T. M. (1993). When are sex offenders at risk for reoffending? Results of two long-term follow-up studies. Forum on Corrections Research, 5: 7-10.
- Prentky, R. A., Lee, A. F. S., Knight, R. A. & Crece, D. (1997). Recidivism rates among child molesters and rapists: a methodological analysis. Law and Human Behavior, 21: 635-659.
- Quinsey, V., Harris, G., Rice, M., & Lalumiere, M. (1993). Assessing Treatment Efficacy in Outcome Studies of Sex Offenders. Sex Offender Treatment 8, (4) 512-523.
- Rice, M. E., Quinsey, V. L. & Harris, G. T. (1991). Sexual recidivism among child molesters released from a maximum security psychiatric institution. Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 29: 381-386.
- Romero, J. J. & Williams, L. M. (1985). Recidivism among convicted sex offenders: A 10-year follow-up study. Federal Probation, 49: 58-64.

Song, L. & Leib, R. (1995). The Twin Rivers Sex Offender Treatment Program: Recidivism rates. Washington State Sex Offenders: Overview of Recidivism Studies. Washington State Institute for Public Policy: Olympia, WA.

Swanson, C. K., & Garwick, G. B. (1990). Treatment for low-functioning sex offenders: Group therapy and interagency coordination. Mental Retardation, 28: 155-161.

Vermont Center for Prevention and Treatment of Sexual Abuse. (1996). Vermont Treatment Program for Sexual Aggressors: Program Evaluation. Vermont Center for Prevention and Treatment of Sexual Abuse.

Washington Department of Corrections, & Dizon, J. (1994). Evaluation of the Sex Offender Treatment Program at Twin Rivers Corrections Center: Phase 1 - A Retroactive Study. Washington State Department of Corrections, Planning and Research Section: Olympia, WA.

CHAPTER 8: PROGRAMS FOR CHEMICALLY-DEPENDENT OFFENDERS

Anglin, M.D., & Hser, Y. (1991). Criminal justice and the drug-abusing offender: Policy issues of coerced treatment. Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 9, 243-267.

Anglin, M. D., & Hser, Y.I. (1990). Treatment of drug abuse. In M. Tonry and J.Q. Wilson (Eds.). Drugs and crime. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Anglin, M.D., & Maugh, T.H. (1992). Ensuring success in interventions with drug-using offenders. The Annals of the American Academy, 521, 66-90.

Anglin, D.M., Longshore, D., Turner, S., McBride, D., Inciardi, J., & Prendergast, M. (1996). Studies on The Functioning and Effectiveness of Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime: Final Report.

Bureau of Justice Statistics (1995). The Nation's Correctional Population Tops 5 Million. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Chaiken, M. R. (1986). Crime rates and substance abuse among types of offenders. In B. D. Johnson & E. Wish (Eds), Crime Rates Among Drug-Abusing Offenders. Final report to the National Institute of Justice. New York: Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

Chaiken, M.R. (1989). In-Prison Programs for Drug-Involved Offenders. National Institute of Justice: Issues and Practices. Washington DC: National Institute of Justice.

Chaiken, M. R. & Chaiken, J. M. (1982). Varieties of criminal behavior. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

- Clear, T. R. & Braga, A. A. (1995). Community Corrections. In Wilson, J.Q., & Petersilia, J. (Eds.) Crime. San Francisco: ICS Press.
- Falkin, G. P., Wexler, H. K. & Lipton, D. S. (1992). Drug treatment in state prisons. In D. R. Gerstein & H. J. Harwood (Eds). Treating Drug Problems (Vol. II, pp. 89-132). Washington, D.C: National Academy Press.
- Field, G. (1989). The effects of intensive treatment on reducing criminal recidivism of addicted offenders. Federal Probation, 53, 51-56.
- Field, G. (1992). Oregon prison drug treatment programs. In C.G. Leukefeld, and F.M. Timms (Eds), Drug Abuse Treatment in Prisons and Jails. Rockville, MD: Institute on Drug Abuse.
- Finigan, M. (1996). Societal Outcomes and Cost Savings of Drug and Alcohol Treatment in the State of Oregon. Report prepared for Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs, Oregon Department of Human Resources, and Governor's Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs.
- Gerstein, D.R. & Harwood, H.J. (1992). Treating Drug Problems. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Hiller, M.L., Knight, K., Devereux, J., & Hathcoat, M. (1996). Post-treatment for substance-abusing probationers mandated to residential treatment. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 28, 291-296.
- Inciardi, J. A. (1979). Heroin use and street crime. Crime and Delinquency, 25: 335-46.
- Johnson, B. D. & Wish, E. D. (1986). The impact of substance abuse on criminal careers. In Alfred Blumstein, Jacqueline Cohen, Jeffrey A. Roth & Christy Visser (eds). Criminal Careers and "Career Criminals." Vol. 2. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Latessa, E.J. & Moon, M.M. (1992). The Effectiveness of Acupuncture in an Outpatient Drug Treatment Program. Journal of Contemporary Justice, 8 (4) 317-331.
- Leukefeld, C.G., & Tims, F.M. (Eds). (1992). Drug Abuse Treatment in Prisons and Jails. National Institute of Drug Abuse, Research Monograph Series, No. 18. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Martin, S.S., Butzin, C.A., & Inciardi, J. (1995). Assessment of a multistage therapeutic community for drug involved offenders. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 27(1), 109-116.
- Martin, S.S., Lockwood, D., Inciardi, J.A. & Freeman, J. (1992). Predicting Relapse and Recidivism Among Released drug using inmates: The efficacy of treatment alternatives. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting for the American Sociological Association, Pittsburgh, PA.

- Moon, M.M., & Lattice, E.J. (1994). Drug treatment in adult probation: An evaluation of an outpatient and acupuncture program. Evaluation and Program Planning, 17, 217-226.
- Nemes, S., Wish, E., & Messina, N. (1998). The District of Columbia Treatment Initiative (DCI). Center for Substance Abuse Research. University of Maryland, College Park, MD.
- Nurco, D., Hanlan, T. & Kinlock, T. (1990). Offenders, Drugs and Treatment. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Justice.
- Oregon Department of Corrections. (1994). Comparison of Outcomes and Costs: Residential and Outpatient Treatment Programs for Inmates - Alcohol and Drug, Mental Health, Sex Offender, and Social Skills Treatment. Oregon Department of Corrections, Research and Evaluation Unit: Salem, OR.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1992). Intensive supervision programs for drug offenders. In (Byrne, J.M., Lurigio, A.J., & Petersilia, J. (Eds). Smart Sentencing: The Emergence of Intermediate Sanctions, (pages 18-37). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Prendergast, M.L., Wellisch, J., & Wong, M.M. (1996). Residential treatment for women parolees following prison-based drug treatment: Treatment experiences, needs, and service outcomes. The Prison Journal, 76, 253-274.
- Rhodes, W. & Gross, M. (1997). Case Management Reduces Drug Use and Criminality Among Drug-Involved Arrestees: An Experimental Study of an HIV Prevention Intervention. A final summary report presented to the National Institute of Justice and the National Institute on Drug Abuse.
- Simpson, D.D., Savage, J., & Lloyd, M.R. (1979). Follow-up evaluation of treatment of drug abuse during 1969 to 1972. Archives of General Psychiatry, 36: 772-780.
- Speckart, G., & Anglin, D.M. (1986). Narcotics and crime: A causal modeling approach. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 2 : 3-28.
- Travis, J., Wetherington, C., Feucht, T.E., & Fisher, C. (1996). Drug-Involved Offenders in the Criminal Justice System. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, Working Paper - 96-02.
- Van Stelle, K.R., Mauser, E., & Moberg, D.P. (1994). Recidivism to the criminal justice system of substance-abusing offenders diverted into treatment. Crime and Delinquency, 40, 175-196.
- Vito, G.F., Wilson, D.G., & Holmes, S.T. (1993). Drug testing in community corrections: Results from a four-year program. The Prison Journal, 73, 343-354.

Wexler, H.K., Faulkin, G.P., Lipton, D.S., Rosenbloom, A.B., & Goodlowe, L.P. (1988). A Model Prison Rehabilitation Program: An Evaluation of the 'Stayin' Out' Therapeutic Community. New York: Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

Wexler, H.K., Graham, W.F., Koronowski, R., & Lowe, L. (1995). Evaluation of Amity In-Prison and Post-release Substance Abuse Treatment Programs. Washington, DC: National Institute of Drug Abuse.

CHAPTER 9: ANGER/STRESS MANAGEMENT

Eisikovits, Z.C. & Edleson, J.L. (1989). Intervening with men who batter: A critical review of the literature. Social Service Review, 385-413.

Faulkner, K., Stoltenberg, C.D., Cogen, R., Nolder, M. & Shooter, E. (1992). Cognitive-behavioral group treatment for male spouse abusers. Journal of Family Violence, 7, 37-55.

Gondolf, E. W. (1993). Male batterers. In Family Violence: Prevention and Treatment. R. L. Hampton et al. (Eds.), pg. 230-257.

Hughes, G.V. (1993). Anger management program outcomes. Forum on Corrections Research, 5: 5-9.

Hunter, D. (1993). Anger management in the prison: An evaluation. Forum on Corrections Research, 5: 3-5.

Marquis, H. A., Bourgon, G. A., Armstrong, B., & Pfaff, J. (1996). Reducing recidivism through institutional treatment. Forum on Correctional Research, 8:3-5.

Motiuk, L., Smiley, C., & Blanchette, K. (1996). Intensive programming for violent offenders: A comparative investigation. Forum on Corrections Research, 8: 10-12.

Serin, R. (1994). Treating Violent Offenders: A Review of Current Practices. Correctional Research and Development: Ontario, Canada.

Serin, R. (Personal communication: February, 1998).

Serin, R. & Brown, B. (1996). Strategies for enhancing the treatment of violent offenders. Forum on Corrections Research, 8.

CHAPTER 10: VICTIM AWARENESS

MADD (1998). Minnesota MADD Homepage: Victim Impact Panels.
<http://www.mtn.org/maddmn/Vicimp>.

Shinar, D. & Compton, R.P. (1995). Victim impact panels: Their impact on DWI recidivism. Alcohol, Drugs and Driving, 11: 73-87.

Stutz, W.A. (1994). Victim Awareness Educational Program Evaluation. Washington State Department of Corrections, Division of Community Corrections, Victim Awareness Unit.

CHAPTER 11: LIFE SKILLS TRAINING

Austin, T. (1997). Life Skills for Inmates: An Evaluation of Dauphin County Prison's LASER Program. Unpublished paper. Shippensburg University, Shippensburg, PA.

Gerber, J., & Fritsch, E.J. (1995). Adult academic and vocational correctional education programs: A review of recent research. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 22 (½):119-142.

Melton, R., & Pennell, S. (1998). Staying Out Successfully: An Evaluation of an In-Custody Life Skills Training Program. San Diego Association of Governments.

Miller, M. (1995). The Delaware life skills program: Evaluation report, August 1995. Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Review, 4 (3): 1-4.

Miller, M. (1997). Evaluation of the Life Skills Program. Division of Correctional Education, Delaware State Department of Corrections.

Naymark, R. (1976, March). Prison without walls teaches job skills. Worklife, 1 (3): 30-34.

Ross, R., Fabiano, E.A., & Ewles, C.D. (1988). Reasoning and rehabilitation. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 32 (1): 29-35.